

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
WESTERN DIVISION**

KEYONNA J. B.,

Plaintiff,

v.

LELAND DUDEK, Acting  
Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

No. 2:24-cv-02943-WDK-BFM

**ORDER ACCEPTING  
MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S  
REPORT AND  
RECOMMENDATION**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the Complaint, all the records and files herein, the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 21), and Plaintiff's Objections to the Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 23). The Court has engaged in a de novo review of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections have been made. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc).

In doing so, the Court has declined to consider any arguments raised for the first time only in the objections. *See United States v. Howell*, 231 F.3d 615, 621-23 (9th Cir. 2000). It has also declined to consider objections that simply repeat arguments fully addressed but rejected in the Report and

Recommendation. *See Trejo Perez v. Madden*, 2020 WL 1154807, at \*1 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2020) (objections that “merely repeat[] the same arguments . . . considered and found to be insufficient” require no review since they “do not meaningfully dispute the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations”); *Hagberg v. Astrue*, 2009 WL 3386595, at \*1 (D. Mont. Oct. 14, 2009) (“Objections to a magistrate’s Findings and Recommendations are not a vehicle for the losing party to relitigate its case.”).

Concluding that nothing in Plaintiff’s objections affects the material findings and conclusions in the Report and Recommendation, the Court accepts the recommendations of the Magistrate Judge.

ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED:

1. The Report and Recommendation is accepted.
2. The decision of the ALJ is affirmed.
3. Plaintiff’s Complaint is dismissed and the action is dismissed with prejudice.
4. Judgment shall be entered consistent with this Order.
5. The Court Clerk shall serve this Order and the Judgment on all counsel or parties of record.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



DATED: August 5, 2025

---

HONORABLE WILLIAM D. KELLER  
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE